

HOW THE INITIATIVES STACK UP

Citizen's Growth Initiative

Requires growth boundaries and bars service expansions outside that area at taxpayer expense.

Requires voter approval of both the plans and amendments.

Requires developers to pay the "full cost" of roads, sewers, schools, etc. — with exceptions for infill.

Allows citizens to file lawsuits to enforce provisions of the initiative.

No constitutional changes needed for the state to preserve its land. That will probably be the subject of another initiative.

Gives counties far greater power over "wildcat" subdivisions and chaotic lot-splitting.

Allows the county more control over smaller subdivisions.

Allows waiver of impact fees in infill areas, but limits those areas to 10 percent of growth boundary.

Prohibits the state from requiring the consent of property owners to rezone.

Requires all of the \$20 million a year authorized by Growing Smarter be used to buy open space.

Allows the state to use some of that \$20 million a year to buy privately owned "natural areas."

Requires "reasonable" access to lands bought with Growing Smarter money.

Requires state land department to develop the plans for use of state lands.

Bars development that puts "unreasonable" burden on ground and surface water supplies.

Authorizes impact fees for schools. This could produce a wind-fall for fast-growing schools but drive up the cost of housing.

Growing Smarter (1998 + 2000)

Allows for voluntary boundaries.

Recommends voter approval of general plans in cities — but not amendments. It does require a two-thirds council vote for changes.

Current law requires "fair share" impact fees — an ambiguous term.

No provision.

Amends the constitution so the state can save up to 3 percent of its land for open space — including 70,000 acres designated on the ballot.

Actually weakens county powers in this area, but does require better disclosure.

Little change in weak county regulatory powers.

Allows quicker review, fee waivers and different standards for infill.

The Legislature keeps flirting with imposing such so-called "takings" restrictions.

Would allow purchase of state land under Growing Smarter for other things — like farming and grazing.

Restricts that \$20 million to buying state lands.

No requirement.

Allows developers who ultimately buy the land to do the planning.

Requires general plans to consider water needs, but doesn't necessarily restrict development as a result.

Allows the state to donate land to schools. The projected 270,000 acres in state land that could become open space would otherwise be sold to support schools.

Note: Most of the provisions of Growing Smarter have already been adopted by the Legislature. The most significant provisions on the ballot will be the constitutional amendments necessary for the state land department to set aside 270,000 acres for preservation and open space, including 70,000 acres specifically designated on the ballot.